



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/845,734 | 04/30/2001 | Walter Dixon III | 345708003US | 3801 |

28062 7590 02/24/2005

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC
5 ELM STREET
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

DAS, CHAMELI

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2122

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/845,734 | Applicant(s) DIXON ET AL. | |
| | Examiner CHAMELI C DAS | Art Unit 2122 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the RCE filed on 1/14/2005.
2. Claims 1, 5, 17 and 37 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claims 3-4, the limitation "including suppressing the reporting of input attribute", the present specification does not describe the above limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2122

As per claim 1, in line 4, the limitation "providing said program, said program having interactions" is unclear. The Examiner interprets the claim limitation as "providing said program having interactions".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flanagan et al (Flanagan), US 6,243,737.

As per claim 1, Flanagan et al (Flanagan) discloses:

- a method in a computer system for determining resolution of attributes of a program (Abstract, col 17, lines 10-19)
- analyzing the program prior to run time (Abstract), where " The host inputs are resolved to addressable references before run-time" clearly shows that analyzing the program prior to run-time as claimed

- each interaction having command with attributes (abstract, and in col 5 lines 50-55)
- program having interactions (col 6, lines 15-22), where “ transactions” are interactions
- identifying a sequence of interactions of the program (col 8, lines 45-54)
- for each command of the interaction for each input attribute of the command, identifying an output attribute corresponding to the input attribute (col 7 lines 51-55), where “ the host transaction B has two *host input fields (HBI-1 and HBI-2) and two host output fields (HBO-1 and HBO-2)*” clearly shows that identifying an output attribute corresponding to the input attribute as claimed
- indicating that the input attribute is resolved if the identified output attribute has been indicated as resolved (col 2, lines 19-26, col 17, lines 11-19)
- indicating that the input attribute is not resolved if the identified output attribute has not been indicated as resolved (col 17, lines 50-57 and col 18 lines 23-29)
- for each output attribute of the command, indicating that the output attribute is resolved (col 17 lines 53-56, col 18 lines 20-27).

As per claim 2, Flanagan et al (Flanagan) discloses:

- including reporting input attributes whose resolution is set to unresolved (col 21, lines 45-64), where error message is made if the host transaction is failed. The host transaction is failed if all the input and corresponding output has not received (i.e. input attribute is not resolved) (col 21 lines 42-60).

As per claim 28, Flanagan et al (Flanagan) discloses:

- a computer system for processing each function of a computer program prior to runtime by of each input parameter of the function , determining whether a source of input parameter would be resolved (Abstract), during execution of the computer program (col 3 lines 21-26, col 1 lines 39-41),
- and for each output parameter of the function, indicating the output parameter is resolved (col 18, lines 5-10, col 18 lines 23-29, col 17, lines 10-20),
- wherein output parameters are sources of input parameters (col 18, lines 6-10), where “ host input fields that generate the host output field” , clearly shows that output parameters are sources of input parameters as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-8, 11-20, 22-27, 29-31, 33-41, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan, US 6,243,737 and further in view of Barritz et al, Barritz (US 6,519,766)

As per claims 5, 17, Flanagan et al (Flanagan) discloses:

- verifying resolution of input parameters of function of a computer program before executing the computer program (*Flanagan, abstract*)
- each input parameter of the function indicating that the input parameter is resolved if a corresponding output parameter has been indicated as resolved as a result of execution having previously processed (col 2, lines 19-26, col 17, lines 11-19, col 15, lines 66-67 and col 16 lines 1-10)
- for each output parameter of the function, indicating that the output parameter is resolved (col 17 lines 53-56, col 18 lines 20-27).

- Flanagan discloses resolving the references during execution time. Flanagan does not specifically disclose path of the execution identifying a sequence of function of the computer program. However, Barritz discloses path of the execution identifying a sequence of function of the computer program (Barritz, abstract). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to evaluate the performance of the program under evaluation.

For claims 6, 18, 29, 39, (Flanagan, abstract, col 1, lines 6-10, col 2 lines 11-26).

For claims 7, 19, 30, 40, (Flanagan, col 2 lines 11-26).

For claims 8, 20, 31, 41, (Flanagan, col 6 lines 15-22).

For claim 37, see the rejection of claim 5.

For claims 11, 22, 33, (Flanagan, col 3 lines 45-60),

For claims 12, 23, (Flanagan, col 10 lines 26-29), where input has a specific name and in col 11 lines 1-5 shows that output has the similar information (name) as input.

For claim 13, 24, (Flanagan, Fig 20 B).

For claims 14, 25, 34, 43, (Flanagan, col 11 lines 50-65).

For claims 15, 26, 35, 44, (Flanagan, col 11 lines 63-67, col 12 lines 1-25).

For claims 16, 27, 36, 45 (Flanagan, col 12, lines 10-15).

For claim 38, (Flanagan, col 11, lines 63-67 col 12 lines 1-15), where the administrator (user) enter the information in the field and the field type may be “ integer which is a primitive type and in the runtime is shown in (col 5 lines 60-63).

7. Claims **9, 21, 32, 42**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan, US 6,243,737 and further in view of Barritz et al, (Barritz), US 6,519,766 and Lindsay et al (Lindsay), US 6,754,670.

As per claims 9, 21, 32, 42, neither Flanagan nor Barritz disclose set and get methods as claimed. However, Lindsay discloses set and get methods as claimed (Lindsay, col 3, lines 66-67, col 4 lines 1-5). The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to update the internal object attributes.

8. Claim **10 is** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan, US 6,243,737 and further in view of Barritz et al, (Barritz), US 6,519,766, Lindsay et al (Lindsay), US 6,754,670 and official notices taken by the examiner.

As per claim 10, Lindsay does not specifically disclose attribute values set with an assignment statement. However, official notice is taken for setting values with

an assignment statement. The modification would be obvious because one of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to compute the attribute value efficiently.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made or record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

TITLE: Multi-object fetch component, US 6529948 B1

TITLE: Method of performing a reverse analysis of a program and its apparatus, US 5970244 A

TITLE: Events as activities in process models of workflow management systems, US 6065009 A

TITLE: System for I/O management where I/O operations are determined to be direct or indirect based on hardware coupling manners and/or program privilege modes, US 5925109 A

TITLE: Method and apparatus for software testing using a differential testing technique to test compilers, US 5754860 A

TITLE: System for monitoring and analysis of a continuous process, US 4752897 A

TITLE: Object oriented method of structuring a software step program, US 6226783 B1

Art Unit: 2122

TITLE: Method and apparatus for controlling the deferred execution of user requests in a data processing system, US 5448731 A

TITLE: Method of determining the unique ID of an object through analysis of attributes related to the object, US 5946681 A.

TITLE: Computer-readable recording medium storing resolution converting program, resolution converting device and resolution converting method, US 6820137 B2.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chameli Das whose telephone number is 571-272-3696.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 A.M. to 3:30 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Tuan Dam can be reached at 571-272-3695. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Chameli C. Das
CHAMELI C. DAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/18/05